

VOLUME XIII

APRIL, 1927

NUMBER 4

BULLETIN

OF

THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS

EDUCATIONAL DISCUSSION
LIST OF COMMITTEES

PUBLISHED BY
THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS
20TH AND NORTHAMPTON STS., EASTON, PA.
EDITORIAL OFFICE, 222 CHARLES RIVER ROAD
CAMBRIDGE
MASSACHUSETTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Notes and Announcements

Income Tax Deduction.....	239
Manufacturers and Merchants Federal Tax League.....	239
Summer Courses at the Sorbonne.....	240
Brief Notes.....	240

Educational Discussion

Some Aspects of University Administration, <i>J. C. Futrall</i>	241
Inaugural Address, <i>A. B. Hall</i>	244
The Junior College, <i>W. W. Campbell</i>	247
Research and the Universities, <i>J. H. Penniman</i>	250
Research as a Method of Education, <i>A. J. Carlson</i>	251
The University as a Training School for College and University Teachers, <i>V. T. Thayer</i>	254
No Such Negative Freedom, <i>A. Meiklejohn</i>	255
The Fine Arts in Liberal Education, <i>G. L. Omwake</i>	257
General Final Examinations and Tutors, <i>J. S. P. Tatlock</i>	259
Sense on Lectures and Discussion, <i>W. Orton</i>	260
The Students' Share in College, <i>H. N. MacCracken</i>	263
The Perils of Magnanimity, <i>Hans Zinsser</i>	266

Local and Chapter Notes

Harvard, New Plan of Honors in English.....	270
Periods of Reading without Instruction.....	270
Minnesota, Student Increase.....	272
New York University, Foreign Centers.....	273
North Dakota Chapter, Constitution.....	273
Northwestern, Family Background and College Success..	275
Pennsylvania, Vice-Provosts.....	275
Princeton, Student Government.....	276
Smith, The New Curriculum for Freshmen and Sophmores.	277
Yale, Board of Admissions, The Freshman Year.....	278

Committees for 1927.....	280
--------------------------	-----

Membership

Members Elected.....	286
Nominations for Membership.....	288

NOTES AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

INCOME TAX DEDUCTION.—In the *Bulletin* of December, 1924, page 3, is a reference to the United States income tax authorities to the effect that teachers may deduct for income tax purposes expenses paid for secretarial services used in the course of their professional work. Since that time a similar ruling has been received from the Income Tax Bureau of the State of New York reversing a previous ruling and allowing the corresponding deduction from the State Income Tax. Possibly these precedents may be of value in other states in case the government officials are in the first place inclined to rule that payments for secretarial service come under the head of personal expenses rather than professional.

In the State of Massachusetts, only, a ruling of the court has recently been made allowing the deduction of royalties for income tax purposes in certain cases. This is apparently due to a law peculiar to that one state.

"MANUFACTURERS AND MERCHANTS FEDERAL TAX LEAGUE."—The bulletin of this organization publishes a statement headed "Educators Fear to Investigate Professor Ely's 'Research' Institute." It would doubtless be taking the M. M. F. T. L. too seriously to quote from the article at length but as the matter has been insistently thrust upon the attention of members of the Council, and possibly others, the following typical extracts from its bulletin are reprinted. Referring to the American Council on Education, the American Economic Association and the American Association of University Professors, the statement reads in part:

"But the League was not prepared for such an exhibition of side-stepping, pusillanimity, and cowardice as it encountered. Instead of getting the desired inquiry of the fraudulent Ely Institute, the Manufacturers and Merchants Federal Tax League got, from all but one of the organizations, an outright refusal to investigate it.

"Remarkable, indeed, are the ways of our leading educators! When it comes to urging others who are outside of our schools, colleges, and universities to 'stand up for honesty' they have the courage of lions; when it comes to standing up for this honesty themselves, and within the very institutions of which they are a part, they have the courage of whining jackals!"

It may perhaps be admitted that the case of the League against

Professor Ely can scarcely be quite so bad as the method of presenting it.

SUMMER COURSES AT THE SORBONNE.—Announcement is made of French summer courses with conducted visits and academic tours. The courses are in French Language and Literature; the conducted visits include every week five trips to interesting points near Paris (on Thursdays), and every Sunday an excursion to a picturesque spot in Northern France. Lectures are given on literature, philosophy, education, history, politics, and sociology. The academic tour is the conclusion and illustration of the practical and theoretical lessons. One itinerary includes, Geneva, Grenoble, Nice, Genoa, Milan, and Lausanne, and there are briefer tours to Southern France and the Chateau country in one case, and to Normandy and Brittany in the other. Further details may be obtained on application to M. Henri Goy, Director of Summer Courses, Sorbonne, Paris.

BRIEF NOTES.—*School and Society* for February 26 contains an article on the "Prediction of Scholastic Success in College" by Professor H. A. Toops of Ohio State University.

The *Educational Record* for January, 1927, contains a notable address by Dean Hawkes of Columbia University on "Religion in a Liberal Education;" also a study of "Student Personnel at Minnesota," connecting with the report of that Institution referred to in the July issue of the *Record*.

School and Society for February 5th contains the address delivered by Professor E. H. Wilkins on "The Relation of Intercollegiate Football to the Purpose of the American College," at the annual meeting of the National Collegiate Athletic Association, New York City.

EDUCATIONAL DISCUSSION

SOME ASPECTS OF UNIVERSITY ADMINISTRATION.¹—" . . . The president's tenure is usually said to be indefinite or at the pleasure of the board. An examination into the actual facts in state universities would seem to indicate that there is a source of weakness. A change in the presidency almost always means more or less of an upheaval in the institution. Of the forty-six state universities, forty-one now have presidents. These have served their institutions an average of only six and three-quarter years. Only eight have served more than ten years. Of these, four are in the twelve states of the Old South, and a fifth has recently announced his retirement after a service of thirty years. This condition may be due to the traditional conservatism of the South. In the past thirteen years the forty-six institutions have had one hundred and ten presidents.

"Concerning tenure of office for faculty members, the rule seems to be that the tenure for professors and associate professors is permanent or indefinite, except for cause, after the first year of service. The principal causes for removal are given as inefficiency and misconduct. In a considerable number of cases the rules provide that whenever an attempt is made to remove a professor who is on indefinite or permanent tenure, he shall have the right of a trial of the case before a committee of his colleagues, whose recommendations in the matter shall be submitted to the governing board. Sometimes this committee is appointed by the president and sometimes it is chosen by the faculty. In other cases the professor has the right to a hearing before the board or a committee thereof.

"Assistant professors are appointed first for one year, and usually after that for a period of three years, or perhaps five years. Instructors are very generally on a one-year tenure, and the statement is sometimes made that the institution is not in any way obligated to retain the instructor, or, in a smaller number of cases, the assistant professor, after his term of office expires. In other words, the contract is accepted with the understanding that the institution may terminate it at the end of the period without giving to the appointee any reason therefor. In a number of these institutions, however, the instructor or assistant professor, in case he is not to be offered reappointment, must be given that information three months or more before the end of the session. . .

¹ Address delivered on November 15 before the National Association of State Universities, Washington, D. C.

"After a study of all obtainable pamphlets and bulletins on the subject, one reaches the conclusion that there are few definite, fixed, and generally accepted rules governing internal organization and management. One doubts whether an elaborate code worked out in great detail is of much value. At any rate, the great majority of the institutions on the approved list of the Association of American Universities do not seem to think so. In some cases an elaborate code fails to secure the desired results. In others the statement is made that the written rules are frequently disregarded.

"In the past quarter or third of a century there has been a strong tendency to give the president power and hold him responsible for results. In a public school system it is quite common for the city superintendent to have autocratic powers, subject only to the action of the governing board. The teachers have little part in the working of the school except to teach their classes. In state universities particularly public opinion seems to assume that the president has the same kind of power. It is believed, for example, that he can dismiss or reinstate a student at his pleasure. If the son of a prominent citizen is dropped out for failure in scholarship, a plea is made that the president shall take him back. The reply that the president does not handle such matters personally, but that these things are done by the dean or by a scholarship committee in accordance with a fixed and settled policy, carries little weight. If a student fails to secure admission because he does not quite meet the requirements or if he fails to graduate because he has a little work unfinished, the president is often expected by the boy or his parents to issue an order that will set the matter right.

"Thwing, in his recent book on the college president, states that the great development and growth of universities in the last generation has been coordinate with the increased powers given to presidents. A very apparent tendency at the present time, however, is to give to the faculty and the deans a larger share in those matters that affect the personal fortunes and the working conditions of faculty members. This is more evident in the case of institutions on a private foundation than it is in state universities. A state university president is the buffer between the institution and the political régime controlling the state. If he is so hampered by checks on his authority exercised by other members on the staff who do not and cannot understand the delicate questions that come up

between the university and the people of the state, the institution may be headed for trouble.

"To sum up, it may be said that the state universities appear now to be in the third stage of development in relation to the administrative matters that have been discussed in this paper. The first stage embraced the period when the governing board was not only the governing body, but to a large extent the administrative body as well. In those days the governing board often decided such things as promotions, appointments, dismissals, salary increases, budget making, etc., without the advice of the president or any other responsible university official, and sometimes contrary to his advice. Thus, 'log rolling' on the part of individual members of the faculty and of other persons became the order of the day. As a result, there came from faculties themselves a demand for a responsible university official who could see the faculty viewpoint and who could protect the faculty and the institution itself from its governors. This ushered in the second stage, with the president having larger powers. As time went on the powers of the president usually increased and the governing boards came to pay less and less attention to the internal working of the institution.

"In the present or third stage, there are found some faculty members who appear to believe that the president ought to be an officer who will represent the institution before the public, secure the necessary funds for maintenance and for operation, but have no more power than any faculty member over appointments, promotions, dismissals, budget, etc. There is little evidence, however, pointing towards the introduction of a policy of that kind. Faculty members in general appear to be willing for the president and deans to have very considerable powers, provided the members of the faculty themselves have some means of securing sympathetic hearing for their departmental and personal claims. There have been numerous instances of faculty members being unwilling to sit in judgment upon important matters affecting their colleagues, but preferring that such things be settled by the administrative officers.

"As for the president of a state university, it would appear that he must, for an indefinite period in the future, continue his attempts to reconcile irreconcilable ideas and warring factions, while devoting such time as he may to constructive educational statesmanship. And fortunate will he be if the political gods who would control

the destiny of the institution grant him respite for the orderly development of a policy."

J. C. FUTRALL, University of Arkansas,
in *School and Society*, No 633.

INAUGURAL ADDRESS.—" . . . The evils of mass production are obvious. All students are treated alike. No allowance is made for individual differences. The standards of advancement and promotion are the same for the bright as they are for the dull. These standards are generally sufficiently low to allow the average student, with reasonable effort, to receive the expected advancement. This means that the student with unusual ability does not have a job adequate to his needs. He becomes a loafer. Students with only half a job generally do work much inferior to that done when they are fully occupied. The result is that such students, who perhaps have a spark of genius, do not find in their university requirements a task that challenges and stimulates. Potential genius remains unknown, while the best students are demoralized by habits of indolence and indifference.

"On the other hand, there are those who have peculiar difficulties that make even the normal task oppressive until the difficulties have been met and solved. Instead of seeking out these students and applying corrective training, they are subjected to the same standardized treatment and are frequently discouraged or overworked.

"Modern learning has made available a possible remedy for these ills. By mental tests and measurements and professional diagnosis we are learning to determine the peculiar aptitudes and special needs of the individual. By a process of corrective training we are overcoming difficulties and increasing the accomplishments of the backward by determining the man with unusual faculties and creating a special task worthy of his abilities we are developing, rather than demoralizing, our natural leaders. . .

"The development and application of these tests and measurements require great individual attention and a larger teaching staff, but it is difficult to find a better way in which the public funds can be invested than in making education fit the peculiar needs of the individual student. The greatest waste in America today is the waste of man power. One of the greatest tragedies of life is to find an individual working at a task for which he is not prepared,

or who is physically or mentally unfit. More attention to individual differences and to corrective educational efforts will go far in eliminating this tragic human waste and in enabling education to fulfill its high ideals.

"Another problem which confronts us is the problem of providing a qualitative rather than quantitative test for academic advancement and promotion. Frequently examinations involve nothing more than parrot-like repetition of facts and theories that have been handed down from the academic throne. Such examinations do not stimulate individual thinking or creative effort; they do not determine real progress in the powers of penetration, criticism, or original thought. An examination that does not provide a challenge to the best intellectual life of the student and afford an accurate measure as to the amount of student achievement in developing habits of clear and original thinking, the accurate sifting of evidence, and the formulation of sound judgment, is not defensible in an institution striving to attain genuine educational ideals. . .

"The second group of problems which confronts us has to do with the encouragement of research. The fundamental importance of scientific research to the service of the state and humanity can scarcely be overstated. . .

"The next problem is how may all of these research activities be adequately developed? In the first place we must have the spirit of inquiry, stimulated and unhampered. Freedom of research and a reasonable allowance of time and energy are the first requisites to an effective program of productive scholarship. It will be the policy of this administration to encourage in every way within its power those men on the faculty who develop a genius for productive scholarship which can be placed at the service of the state. This does not mean that good teaching will not be rewarded. Inspiring and effective teaching is a necessary element in a progressive university, but it seems improbable that the finest teaching will be found in an institution where research is unknown and whose faculty has been left untouched by the divine thirst for knowledge. . .

"The needs of developing social science need scarcely to be stated. Perhaps one illustration will suffice. Today among all the nations of the world there seems to be an agonized desire for peace, and yet those nations have been unable to provide the method by which their ultimate hopes and ideals may triumph over the passing passion of the moment. We lack a sufficient knowledge of the technique

of social control; we do not have an accurate understanding of the functioning of mob psychology, particularly when complicated by the tremendous power of national patriotism. This is a problem which must be worked out by a process of social engineering, and we must evolve a system of control by which reason, rather than passion, will be the dominating power. The developments of the power creating sciences have made human warfare so destructive and terrible that it threatens the existence of the very civilization which created it. The need of the day is for the development of power controlling sciences until they equal in efficiency the power creating disciplines, to the end that mankind can become the conscious arbiter of its own destiny. We must devise a technique for the power controlling sciences that will enable mankind to devise a means by which its noblest aspirations may permanently prevail. . .

"Democracy does not necessarily guarantee the conditions of its own success. It is only an instrument through which the popular will tends to become articulate. Like all other movements of mankind it requires intelligent, aggressive, constructive leadership. But such exalted leadership cannot survive in competition with the demagogue and charlatan, save where the people have learned to distinguish the spurious from the real. This popular capacity does not come as a free gift from the gods. It is not a necessary incident that follows unerringly in the wake of democratic institutions. In certain of the Caribbean countries, where the devices of democracy are all that one could wish, we have rarely had democracy in fact. Military dictators, despots, and tyrants have followed in rapid and tragic succession. The preposterous but glowing promises of the demagogue have always prevailed against the less promising but more possible programs of the leaders. . .

"Has not the time arrived when we must think of the consumers as well as the vendors of the goods of life? Must we not think of the public welfare along with the importance of high powered salesmanship? Must we not begin to think of democracy as well as of demagogues? Must we not be as much concerned with training the people for intelligent decision as we are in training those who seek to guide the people's choice?

"From a standpoint of democracy this is the problem of the education of the adult. . .

"This must be the task of the universities if they will but recognize

the challenge. The universities have devised a technique by which the products of their scholarship may be the most completely freed from the taint of ulterior motive or the sin of propaganda. They are our great centers of research to which the public may look with confidence for enlightenment and instruction. They are the institutions best equipped to undertake the task of scientifically determining the public needs and of devising the appropriate machinery for rendering to the public this fundamental service.

"Every consideration of public welfare, the intellectual and moral growth of the nation, the very foundations of our democracy itself, depend upon our capacity to stimulate and encourage among the great mass of our population the habits of critical and independent thinking and the intelligent conservation and direction of the great emotional powers of life."

ARNOLD BENNET HALL, University of Oregon,
in *School and Society*, No. 627 and 628.

THE JUNIOR COLLEGE—" . . . The attitude of the University to the junior college movement in California is thoroughly friendly and sympathetic, but this attitude is not unconditional. The University is glad to see junior colleges established in communities possessing the population and the financial resources that will make possible the development of institutions of high quality; and, on the other hand, the University would view with regret any proposal to establish a junior college in a region of small population and small wealth. In other words, it will be pleasing to the University administration to see thoroughly good junior colleges developed at additional points in California, as rapidly as the swiftly-growing population and wealth will provide the opportunities. We anticipate that within ten or fifteen years the junior colleges will have increased somewhat in number, and greatly in attendance, with inverse effects upon the number of students in our freshman and sophomore years. But I advise, with all the emphasis of which I am capable, that we do not attempt to bring these results about suddenly; results achieved in that manner would certainly be exceedingly unfortunate for all institutions concerned: the junior colleges, as well as the State University and other colleges and universities. We should follow nature's ways of accomplishing enduring results: let the principles of evolution work their wonders; give time for them to operate, in the right environment. If conditions in such a highly compli-

cated organism as a state-wide school system have, by processes of evolution covering decades, reached a state which does not satisfy us, the thoroughly unwise and bad procedure would lie in trying to go suddenly, by legislative act, to the system we should like to have. The wise plan would provide for gradual approach to the objective, by seeing to it that the environment is correct, and letting the evolutionary forces accomplish the desired end, gradually, and with opportunities for all institutions concerned to adapt themselves to the changing state of affairs.

"The junior college movement is nearly, but not quite, in accord with the European experience of centuries as to their secondary schools. The gymnasium in Germany, the lycee in France, the 'public school' in England, and other similar schools in Germany, France, England, Italy, Holland, Scandinavia, etc., carry their students well into the domain of our sophomore year, and in some respects through our sophomore year, just as our junior colleges plan to do. One difference is that our junior colleges are separate educational units covering two years, whereas in the European schools the corresponding years are but the last two years of continuous curricula covering the half a dozen years or more of their secondary school systems. I doubt, further, if any European of large educational experience ever seriously thought of adding two more years, years corresponding to our junior and senior college years, to their secondary schools and thus make local colleges of them. In their experienced judgment, graduation from their secondary schools is the absolute signal that the time has come for their students to move on to the universities, or to go out into the active world.

"It would not be difficult to recognize a few disadvantages of the junior college system. I am going to mention only one. A very great objection to the system resides in the fact that the presence of a junior college in one of our far western cities seems to be a temptation to certain people and certain organizations to develop it into a local four-year state college of liberal arts. I am opposed to the development of any junior college into a four-year degree-granting college, primarily because that would be against the best interests of higher education in the whole state of California, against the best interests of our bright and ambitious young men and women of the future, no matter in what part of the commonwealth they may live. Some of my reasons are the following:

"1. The development of even one junior college into a four-year college would be the signal for a large number of other junior-college communities to go and do likewise. Within a very few years we should have ten or fifteen such local four-year state colleges, as a minimum.

"2. Some of these local colleges might start out upon purely local financial support, but there is no question that within a few years the state would be called upon to support them. Could the state afford to do so? That is an important question, but it is very far from being the most important consideration.

"3. Such local colleges would be weak institutions, chiefly because their faculties would be weak. Even the University of California, with all its advantages and attractions, does not succeed in finding enough highly intelligent, well-trained professors to meet its requirements. Capable professors will go to a weak local institution only as a last resort, and they will leave it at the first opportunity. No college is a worthy college for junior and senior students unless its faculty contains many real scholars whose names are known to professors in the standard colleges and universities, not only in their own state, but in other states and other nations. Neither should we overlook the fact that a college must have a library, laboratories, and many other expensive items of equipment.

"4. Local institutions are weak because they confine themselves almost wholly to the teaching of textbook facts. . .

"5. It is very far from a misfortune that young men and young women of good intelligence and strong character should be obliged to go away from their homes and their home towns in order to attend college, where they would have to make their own decisions and take the consequences thereof; where they would have to hold their own in competition with other strong minds. That is just what tens of thousands of young men and young women in this country are doing today. *If there are any junior and senior students so weak in mind and character that they cannot safely go 100 miles, or 500 miles, away from home in order to attend a good college, they certainly do not deserve to have a good college, or even a poor college, brought to their doorsteps. They should not go to college at all. Colleges and universities have for their chief purpose the training of the leaders of the future—leaders in public service, along governmental, health-giving, intellectual, and spiritual lines. . .*

"8. Students go to college only once in their lives, and the best

colleges are none too good for them. A high percentage of students attending local colleges of mediocre and even poor quality will believe they are attending colleges equal to the best. It is clearly the duty of those who are charged with high educational responsibility to protect them from that misfortune.

"It seems to me that the proper and wise policy for our junior colleges is to go on developing themselves into the solid, substantial institutions that the corresponding schools are in the old world: to prepare their students in a thorough and dependable manner to enter the junior year in our standard colleges; to finish the schooling of those young men and young women who are not going on to college or university, with two years of thorough and wisely-planned work in preparation for their active, happy, and useful lives in the wide world. These accomplishments, which are in accord with the actual dreams of the founders of the junior colleges, should bring joy in abundance to their executive officers, both local and state. . ."

W. W. CAMPBELL, University of California *Bulletin*, January, 1927.

RESEARCH AND THE UNIVERSITIES—" . . . A second point of interest is that if research workers are to be withdrawn from universities to do the work of research institutions and of industrial corporations, it is important that universities be protected against such withdrawals of those who are in many cases their ablest teachers and investigators. The questions of immediate importance to all who are interested in scientific research are, first, how shall we train and encourage young men and young women to engage in scientific research, and how shall we afford those who are particularly qualified the opportunity to proceed without interruption along lines of study often begun with the doctor's dissertation. Is it possible for universities to set apart more or less completely from the work of teaching a number of men and women who if given the chance would probably develop into important workers in the field of science, or of any other subject included in the courses of study of our institutions of higher learning? It too often happens, as has been pointed out, that the brilliant young student is at once taken as a member of the teaching staff of his institution and loaded with teaching and administrative work to the detriment of his work in scientific investigation. I believe that practically all members of a university staff should do some teaching, not only for the development of their own minds, but also for the establishing of nec-

essary contacts with possible future workers in their respective fields, and I believe also that many a possible research worker has his interest dulled by the routine of too much teaching. An effort that we are making at this university to solve this problem, in part at least, is based upon the idea that a roster may be so arranged that several days in each week may be left free for the teacher to spend in his laboratory. Of course the real researcher will work in spite of unfavorable conditions, some working all night. It is not the fact that teachers do not have time to do research, but rather that their time is so broken up by teaching that it is ordinarily exceedingly difficult to obtain sufficient uninterrupted days in which to engage in serious and continuous pieces of work. It is necessary also for universities to provide sufficient laboratory space, and a freedom from interruption, to encourage the undertaking of research work, particularly by the younger members of the faculty. . .

"There are two aspects of research: one of these is the work of research as a means of the solution of certain so-called practical problems, the other is research in general the object of which, while it may incidentally prove to be practical, does not have practicality as its end and aim, but merely the increase of human knowledge. In the universities, perhaps alone, is to be found in its most complete expression the spirit of pursuing knowledge for its own sake. There also is to be found the complete circle of human knowledge. The chemist, the historian, the mathematician, the geologist, the philologist, preserve a breadth of vision and a sense of proportion, owing to the fact that they are linked side by side in the same institution. Moreover the student in one field frequently finds in his own subject problems that require aid from the student in some other field. The universities, therefore, offer the best combinations of knowledge that are to be found in the world. From the university come the research workers of the future. . ."

JOSIAH H. PENNIMAN, University of Pennsylvania,
in *Science*, No. 1669.

RESEARCH AS A METHOD OF EDUCATION.¹—" . . . An 'educated' man is supposed to have a certain fund of information plus a certain controlled behavior or disciplined emotions. He is supposed to have acquired a certain degree of critical judgment as a matter of auto-

¹ Address of the retiring Chairman of Section N—Medical Sciences, of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, Philadelphia, December, 1926.

matic cerebration; a certain method of arriving at conclusions by analysis. He is supposed to weigh evidence, to keep an open mind in regard to the unknown. When we survey the behavior of humans today, it is very obvious that critical judgment, except in matters of immediate practical interest to the individual, is largely conspicuous by its absence. The scientific method has not yet become a tool in every-day human behavior. We know more facts than ever before, but, on the whole, we do not seem to be much wiser, more sane, and more just than our more ignorant ancestors. This applies to the so-called educated members of society as well as to those who have come in the least contact with the formal educational processes of today. . .

"The present-day educational methods appear to be designed to impart the maximum of information in the minimum of time. As a necessary corollary to this method comes the importance of authority. We learn by doing, and effectively, only by doing. But in our formal education the young generation is seldom permitted to learn by doing. This takes too long time, it is too wasteful of material resources, too many mistakes will be made, because, inevitably inexperienced youth will go through many of the devious paths of error which have been explored and rejected by the adult and so-called educated generation. *Education by dictation* starts in the home. Parents say, 'thou shalt,' and 'thou shalt not;' 'this is so,' and 'that is not so;' and some of it may be true. The fault, nay, the tragedy, is that parents have not the patience, or, in some cases, the ability to take the child through the processes by which this or that particular thing has been proved to be so or not so. In many cases the parents have not the ability to do this because they themselves have received the 'so' or the 'not so' as an earlier fiat of their own parents, their own priests, their own schoolmasters, their own college professors. Added to this type of education by dictation in the home during the most plastic period of the human brain, the frequently equally dogmatic teaching in religion and morals, the same type of memorizing and dictation in the 'three R's' (and even in the sciences) in the primary schools, and add to that the four or more years of pretty much the same memory drill and *ex cathedra* teaching in the college—what may we expect from our educated youth? Information? Yes! Belief in authority? Yes! Mastery of the scientific method? No! . .

"Science is a recent adventure in education. Philosophy, mathe-

matics, languages laid down the general methods of education before science was admitted to the curriculum. Now, science itself has largely assumed the easier method of the older university disciplines, the method of memory-cramming, lecturing and spoon-feeding, even for those who are on the way to become more or less professional scientists (engineers, chemists, physicians) instead of holding on to the method by means of which science grows, namely, the method of *doing*. . .

"My thesis does not imply that the student at any stage should cease to profit by past experience, should cease to learn from books. It does imply that at every stage of education the student should be permitted, if not compelled, as a part of the program, to answer questions, not from books or lectures, but by field investigation or laboratory experimentation, to the end that the scientific method may become as fixed and as natural in his behavior as breathing. . .

"I do not claim that the introduction of research as a part of education at all stages will make all normal men sane all the time. I think it will help to make more men sane on more matters for a greater part of the time. . .

"Every normal person would be benefited by a modicum of research at every stage in the formal educational program.

"We hear so often that 'this is the age of science,' and the stereotyped dictum is usually followed by the evidence in the form of enumeration of the striking list of modern scientific discoveries and practical inventions. These achievements of the few have added to the conveniences of the many, but has society thereby achieved greater sanity? Look at the so-called civilized world about you! Scientific knowledge has increased a thousand fold, but we are yet looking for the dawn of scientific understanding in society. The very name science is being perverted to serve superstition, fakery, and fraud. The results of scientific research may fill the bystander with awe, just as primitive man stood in awe before the eclipse, the earthquake, the lightning, the rainbow, and the phosphorescent sea, but awe does not kindle the cool light of reason.

"I am not sufficiently myopic to promise that individual research as a part of education at all levels will be a panacea against all the credulity and unreason of normal men. In urging it as a hopeful experimental therapy, I do not put undue emphasis on the hope, because society will interfere or try to interfere with the experi-

ment. There will be interference on the part of teachers who are satisfied with present methods. And in any event, we start with material already processed in *education by dictation* at the hands of parents and priests."

A. J. CARLSON, University of Chicago, in *Science*, No. 1675.

THE UNIVERSITY AS A TRAINING SCHOOL FOR COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY TEACHERS.¹—"...If this conception of the functional division of a college education is sound, we have a basis for reconciling the two activities of teaching and research without subordinating one to the other. Both teaching and research are legitimate activities and should be placed upon a basis of equality. A condition of equality implies that one and the same instructor may legitimately be interested in both or may legitimately emphasize one to the exclusion of the other. Since, however, college instructors will at one time or another engage in both activities, their professional preparation should include both types of training.

"If this is to be the case, it is obvious that professional preparation for teaching will have to become a function of universities. We may, therefore, ask what opportunities do these institutions at present afford for performing this function of the professional training of college and university teachers?

"I shall attempt to confine my suggestions to the utilization of instruments already at hand. Practically every university could adopt at once a threefold program. This program should provide for (1) the tangible encouragement of good teaching; (2) some degree of professional training as an initial requirement for teaching in college or university; and (3) for the organization of departmental instruction so as to stimulate the interest of a faculty in the scientific study of teaching and the improvement of teaching method. . .

"To a large extent the seeds for later growth in the practice of teaching must be planted in the previous education and training of the young instructor. It is a common observation at present that college teachers are predominantly specialists rather than the cultivated products of a liberal education. To the degree, therefore, that college education is reorganized so that it becomes an integrated and humanized education, to this same degree will a progressive development of his nature be assured after the young instructor has been admitted to the practice of his profession. The field of

¹ Read at a meeting of the Association of American Universities, at Northwestern University in November, 1926.

teacher-training lies open before us and we can cultivate it as we will. Let us not fail to observe, therefore, that an intelligent and far-seeing program is intimately associated with the larger problem of vitalizing our college curricula. It is in the preliminary education of the prospective teacher and not in a dependence upon an external system of supervision that we must look for assurance as regards his continuous growth.

"There are, nevertheless, direct means for training college teachers in service. These fall primarily within the sphere of departmental activities. For example, when there are a number of parallel sections in a subject, group conferences of the instructors concerned can be utilized to generate a genuine interest in the improvement of instruction. Such conferences enable instructors to pool their experiences and to try out the suggestions that discussion brings forth. Both individual experimentation and group concentration upon common problems will result. Consider what a department thus organized might accomplish by working cooperatively upon the problem of providing adequately for students of different ability levels through appropriate organization of subject-matter and methods of procedure, or by centering upon the problem of determining what class size is most conducive to satisfactory teaching outcomes; or what methods of procedure are best adapted to large groups and to small groups. Ordinarily conferences of instructors teaching parallel sections are no more than clearing-houses for routine and clerical details. They can easily be transformed into seminars on teaching method. And once a beginning is made further opportunities will present themselves in the way of stimulating professional interest. . ."

V. T. THAYER, Ohio State University,

in *School and Society*, No. 626.

NO SUCH NEGATIVE FREEDOM.—". . . As to the course of study in an American college, I take it that I have spoken so much on this and so often that I need to say but little. I am quite sure that as to the course of study, we have got to discard the elective system, if we are going to have a community of learning, and have a definite course of study. We must have all the members of the community engaged in the same intellectual enterprise. Our system as it is separates knowledge into parts and sends each member of the community to a collection of some of the scattered parts. We must

bring them back together again, make some unification of preparation which shall bind us together as students. Various devices have been tried in recent years to establish unity among courses. We have tried orientation courses for freshmen. We have been calling this orientation course an attempt to tell a freshman what he is going to study before he studies it, as he goes into the field of social science, so that he will understand it when he takes it, and I think they have done quite a little in the way of unification. More might be done by a senior course which would attempt to unify different courses after they had been taken. This was done formerly by the old senior course in philosophy. I think that there is one method that ought to be tried and that is the giving up of the division of knowledge altogether. Our elective system is based on the division of the field of knowledge into subjects, and the student takes five at a time. I hope that we are going to discontinue the attempt of studying a number of subjects, and study a civilization in all its aspects at the same time. I should like to get a group of freshmen and acquaint them with Greek civilization as a whole; not separate subjects, but get together a group of students who want to know the way of understanding a life and then take a great episode in human life and see what it looks like as a whole, and see if they can understand how a great people lived; not getting this or that special phase, but considering life as a single thing, for that is what they have to do with the life of today themselves; and I think we shall have to make this experiment of trying the unification by just doing away with the separation. But whatever we find, I am sure we have got to bring our course of studies together in some course of this kind. . .

"To sum the whole matter up: It seems to me in these various ways, all we have to do is to establish an intellectual community to bind a group of people together; a community based on intellect. I think that it can be done only in a small community or group. Our colleges are altogether too large. The great trouble there is not that our student body is too large but that our faculties are large. The great difficulty in this is that the faculty are too numerous to have intellectual unity of their own. If we are to have a community dominated by some single unified point of view, what we need is a small group of teachers where they can know each other intellectually well, where they can get their education from each other, and keep on getting it all the time. I am looking forward to the time, as a big experiment, in which these big institutions

of ours are to be broken up into small pieces, not small in quality but small in numbers, with limited groups of teachers and limited groups of students, with these small groups living together in such a way that they are all acquainted with each other intimately, and so in this way our process of understanding will come through the life of the community. I want to see every young American who goes to college feel the pressure of the community driving him to understanding, the pressure of a small group of teachers who are seeking understanding, and so are driving him toward it, and thus become one who would strive for understanding and so fit himself, as the Chairman has suggested, so fit himself for taking a proper place in the American life. The only point on which I am inclined to differ with your Chairman is that we might have scholarship without leadership. In my opinion, when scholarship does not give leadership, it is because of a difficulty in the scholarship. The man who is called a grind, is defective, is not a good scholar, is not thinking in the way in which a man ought to think in order to live properly."

ALEXANDER MEIKLEJOHN, University of Wisconsin,
in the *New Student*, Jan. 12, 1927.

THE FINE ARTS IN LIBERAL EDUCATION.¹—" . . . There is no body of culture material at the disposal of man more capable of universal acceptance than art. It appeals to every human being because there is implanted in every person the potential gift of art appreciation. Like the gifts of religion and of understanding, however, the gift of art appreciation avails little except by cultivation. Vast areas of what should be rich and profitable experience remain arid and unfruitful in most lives because of the lack of cultivation. . .

"If the sense of beauty does not exist in some degree of cultivation within the soul beauty does not exist in the outside world. There can be no beautiful world for a people lacking the cultivated gift of appreciation. The argument might be extended, but perhaps sufficient has been said to point out the legitimate place of esthetics in a well-rounded life and of the fine arts as materials for educative processes by which the esthetic nature may be aroused and developed . . .

"From the popular point of view what is needed is an army of educated leaders to help the masses of the population who are

¹ Address delivered at the opening of the fifty-seventh year of Ursinus College.

struggling to incorporate art more largely into their scheme of living. To meet this need, colleges should turn out graduates equipped, not necessarily with the technique of art production, but with a comprehensive knowledge of the history, characteristics, ideals, and the chief canons of criticism in each of the main fields of the fine arts. The demand is for instruction in such subjects as music, architecture, painting, sculpture, and landscaping, somewhat similar to the instruction which colleges have long been giving in English literature. To every educated person the names and works of the great musicians, past and present, of great architects, painters, and sculptors, should be as familiar as the names and works of great writers. A survey course covering these fields should be prescribed for all students, and there should be extended studies in each field that might be prescribed for some groups of students and elective for others.

"Approaching the problem of collegiate instruction in the fine arts from the side of art itself the demands are, of course, more exacting. Here most college executives will need expert advice. It may be assumed without asking such advice, however, that the modern laboratory method will be in order. We shall not be able to treat the subject of painting without an art gallery or the subject of music without a concert hall. To what extent studios for actual work in the arts will be required, we shall leave to the experts.

"Certain it is that the great movement for art in this country should have the whole-hearted support of those engaged in the work of liberal education. As the colleges, which really are the key to the situation as far as meeting the popular demand for intelligent guidance is concerned, must take up their responsibility in the matter, benefactors will recognize in them exceptional opportunity for work of immediate and far-reaching importance along this line in American national and social development. Significant beginnings have already been made by the Carnegie Corporation of New York in providing collections of reproductions of great paintings for use in colleges, and by the Presser Foundation of Philadelphia in providing scholarships and buildings for the promotion of musical art in institutions of liberal learning. . .

"It is to gain possession of this kind of wealth that students come to college. The college cannot give it to them—certainly not in the space of four short years—but the college can show them where the true El Dorado lies, can give them the vision of its glories, and

the ability in trained faculties to enter into their possession. To do this adequately, however, it must present with equal emphasis the entities that make up that noble trinity of divine and human ends—the true, the *beautiful*, and the good.”

GEORGE L. OMWAKE, Ursinus College, in *School and Society*, No. 624.

GENERAL FINAL EXAMINATIONS AND TUTORS.¹—“After all that has been said of late years about the various developments in college education which employ the general examination shortly before graduation on the major subject, or field of concentration, it is neither necessary nor desirable to do more than to touch on a few points. What deficiencies in our higher education the systems combat are well known. Well known, also, are the main outlines of the two chief systems.

“The first is that of the general examination in a field for all students who specialize in it. This system, fully developed, requires a large body of tutors to supervise the students’ work and help them to prepare for the general final examinations. *De facto* and up to the present, these men are usually appointed almost purely for this purpose, though, as we shall see, they will not necessarily remain a special body. This scheme is obviously the most expensive and elaborate. It has existed longest and in the most elaborate form at Harvard.

“The second plan is applied only to a strictly selected body of students chosen for their proved ability and zeal; this is the so-called Honors Course, or Independent Study Plan, ending with a general examination. Usually, I believe, these students are released to a large extent from ordinary course requirements, and in most institutions are guided individually by the regular professors; little addition to the regular staff is therefore required. It is the system adopted, or pursued, at Smith, Swarthmore, Columbia, Stanford, and many other institutions. The most important description of it is still that by President Aydelotte of Swarthmore, ‘Honors Courses in American Colleges and Universities’ in the *Bulletin of the National Research Council* (January, 1924). In this plan there is the greatest possible variation in the several institutions. I have only one thing to say about it. It has the great advantage of being more easily introduced than the other, being only moderately expensive. From some observation in the

¹ Address before the Association of American Universities, Northwestern University, November, 1926.

East, I believe, however, that it is more difficult to maintain and continue efficiently than the other, provided the other is adequately supported financially. Especially in smaller, conservative, old-fashioned institutions, it is difficult really to arouse the professors to the possibilities of this educational method and to make the students realize the immense opportunities it offers. It may not be difficult to induce a college faculty to adopt it, now that it has become recognized as an important new educational development. Band-wagon psychology exists in colleges, though they are freer from it than the outside world. If adopted in a half-hearted way, the plan is in danger of becoming neglected and watered down. Students may be discouraged from entering upon it, professors will regard it as a reflection on their courses, and it will fill more space in the college catalog than it fills in anybody's thoughts. What is necessary to make the system vital and permanent is persistent faith, magnetic enthusiasm, vigilance, and hard work through years on the part of more persons than one, preferably on the part of one in each department. There is no use in being stampeded, or forced, or excited into it; unless some leader or leaders have the vision, have caught the infection, and will make it one of their main interests, the thing is liable to fall flat."

J. S. P. TATLOCK, Harvard University,
in *The Educational Record*, Vol. 8, No. 1.

SENSE ON LECTURES AND DISCUSSION.—" 'No student report' says the Nebraska undergraduate committee (quoted in *The New Student* for Dec. 8) 'would be complete without an attack upon the lecture method.' This is so nearly true—and not of student reports alone—that I should like, if I can, to clarify the issue by a little discussion of what the lecture method is and is not supposed to accomplish. The gist of the attack is that the lecture is frequently a substitute for mental activity on the part of the student; that it is apt to exert a repressive effect by reason of the passive and receptive attitude which it often presupposes; that it is frequently stereotyped and uninspiring, closing rather than opening the windows of the mind; and that in so far as it lends itself to dogmatic presentation, it stands positively in the way of educational advance. With all of which emphatically I agree.

"But I am not sure that the responsibility devolves mainly on the 'lecture method' as such. A good deal of it, I think, is based

upon a current American misconception of the function of the lecture. I may illustrate my point from the experience of the Cambridge debating team who recently visited several American colleges. The Cambridge men (I am one myself and so was interested in their impressions) when they stated that their usual class attendance hours were not over eight or nine a week, and that their tradition forbade their remaining indoors of an afternoon were asked 'When do you do any work?' They on the other hand, finding that American students generally had about fifteen hours class attendance, put precisely the same question—'When do you do any work?' The assumptions were different. In the English case the foundation of the system is the student's voluntary reading—voluntary in the sense that there are no specific assignments—to which the lectures and tutorial hours are essentially supplementary. In the American case the foundation is the classroom, supplemented by doses of prescribed reading.

"Now there is all the difference in the world between these two uses of the classroom. In the one case the student comes (or fails to come, at his peril!) with the results of his own limited study in mind, keen to hear what a real authority working in the field has to say about it. If he finds puzzling discrepancies or conflicts that he cannot clear up, he talks them over with his director or his lecturer. But he does not expect to be 'taught the subject' by these people in the sense in which the American student decidedly does; and they do not expect to spend their time ladling out knowledge-and-water to adolescents who are not able to sit at table with the grown-ups.

"Now I suspect that a good deal of the current sponsorship of the discussion method in this country represents a subconscious flight from the responsibility which the British student simply has to accept. It is a camouflaged recurrence of the expectation of being 'taught' in the sense I have just deprecated. It is a plea for the 'stimulation' of mental activity by some external agent. And I doubt whether a general extension of the discussion method is consistent with the advance in the status of the undergraduate that we all want to bring about. I do not mean merely that the discussion method is conceived as a way of helping lame ducks over stiles. I mean, among other things, that it may too thoroughly be what it is so often termed—a stimulant: and robust constitutions use stimulants sparingly because they get a sounder integration

without them. Anyone who has watched the method in the hands of a master like Hamilton at the Brookings Graduate School cannot but be impressed with the beauty as well as the efficacy of it—under such conditions; but I was by no means so confident of its results, so far as I was able to follow them, at Amherst under Meiklejohn. The right undergraduate, with wise guidance (what a stipulation is there!), will get stimulation enough and to spare from his studies—and the other kind had better sell bonds anyway.

"The ideal place for the discussion method is of course the seminar—that is, the cooperative search for knowledge where each participant has something of value to bring; and this is not possible in the early stages of the beginning student. It is not well to inoculate the freshman with the notion that all the concepts he will encounter are debatable. They are not. It is on the whole better for him to measure up to the austere standards of objective scholarship than to adumbrate in native woodnotes wild the deficiencies of his present attainment. If he is good stuff he will desire neither the nursery teaching that the discussion method admits of, nor the slowness of pace that in such a use it entails. Further, there is a faculty consideration. It takes a far abler teacher to handle a discussion than to give a passable lecture. It is not usually the case that where bad lecturing is the trouble, this can be met by opening the class to discussion—with the same teacher. And I fear that the discussion method would in many cases simply enable a poor teaching job to be done poorer and slower because of the absence of such performance standards as the lecture does after all impose. . .

"The primary and essential need, as I see it, is a reduction in the average number of class hours. It is literally true that *the routine requirements of most American colleges render good scholarship simply impossible*. A drastic reduction in the number of class attendances—which would entail in most cases a similar reduction in the number of subjects studied at one time—would have two results: it would give a chance to the considerable number of students who now desire to do more thorough study and cannot; and it would set free faculty time (and, I think, inclination) for the regular but informal conferences with such students as care to come which constitute so important, and so enjoyable, a basis of the system at Oxford and Cambridge. . .

"After all, the most significant, and most hopeful, aspect of current student criticism is the amount of dissatisfaction it reveals

not merely with methods, but with the attainment. More and more American undergraduates are realizing what one of the Cambridge team meant when he said that over here 'students seem to spend their time being taught but not educated.' *Opportunity* to do better work is the burden of many of the reports. It is a demand that can and must be met; and I for one have faith in the sequel."

WILLIAM ORTON, Smith College,
in *The New Student*, Feb. 2, 1927.

THE STUDENTS' SHARE IN COLLEGE.¹—" . . . The American college has always been an experiment. It is more an experiment today than ever before, because for the first time the experiment begins to be conducted upon scientific methods. All over the country new colleges are being planned and old colleges reorganized. . .

"Up in New England on the hills of Old Bennington, a woman's college with a new correlation of knowledge is shortly to be established. At Swarthmore College in Pennsylvania an English honors school is in full operation. Down in North Carolina, on the rolling Piedmont soil of Durham, Duke University is rising, endowed with eighty millions. Here in the Middle West, Antioch College has been reborn upon a plan startlingly original and appealing in many ways. The University of Wisconsin gives the opportunity to test out the faith of Professor Meiklejohn in the possibility of cultural education upon a new plan. A further experiment not yet begun is the plan of a college without trustees or president and administered on liberal and democratic terms. Tentative efforts have already been made in the Middle West for its founding. In the West the new Claremont Colleges in California, with their program recently announced, stand as important examples of what is going on. Unnamed new colleges are being cut out of whole cloth; and the old educational world is watching in order to see whether the pattern will tell us anything. For we are all convinced that some of the old fashions are outworn. . .

"The dead hand of the past lies heavy upon our institutions. The preeminence of Latin survives from the trivium; and the preeminence of mathematics is our inheritance from the quadrivium of the Middle Ages. I hold no brief against them; but they cannot be justified by tradition alone. Far stronger, however, than the

¹ An address delivered at the opening session of the Conference of The National Student Federation of America, held at the University of Michigan, December 2, 1926.

priorities of the classics and mathematics are the traditional methods of instruction and of college life. Progressive education has been at work in our schools for more than a generation and is beginning to modify our curriculum profoundly. It is to be doubted whether the majority of American college professors have ever seen the inside of a progressive school. . . The American people, progressive in many other points, have been utterly reactionary in their attitude towards intellectual training. Parents have discouraged concentration upon study, and employers have put more emphasis upon the non-academic record of the candidate than upon his work in the classroom. . .

"Within the student body, not yet wholly articulate or by any means unanimous in the matter, there is arising a demand for a share in the experiment which has produced the National Student Federation. Its program is based upon the hypothesis that college students from eighteen to twenty-one are, for the most part, responsible human beings. In this generation young men of this age are considered by their elders to be old enough to furnish food for powder and old enough to command squads and companies of other men in the crucial moments of war, and young women are, at eighteen, legally responsible for their own actions as guardians of the future of the race. If they are old enough for such responsibility, then they are old enough to be consulted upon the nature and upon the terms of their studies, old enough to be consulted upon the social conditions of the environment in which they pursue their studies. If they are old enough to be asked to write criticisms of the work of Dante and of Shakespeare then they are old enough to be respected when they criticize classroom methods in their college.

"The students' movement in this country is thus an intellectual movement. . .

"And we teachers are not unmindful of the validity of such arguments, or of the wide-spread nature of the questions that have provoked them. There is scarcely a college executive or a college teacher today who would refuse the invitation of a body such as the National Student Federation to cooperate with you in the laying out of the program by students for a study of the American college and for the discovery of ways in which it can better meet the needs of students of today. . . My chief criticism of the American college executive is that he does not sufficiently trust the students. His own distrust is the starting point of a vicious circle. From his

distrust arises the paternalistic system of college government. From the paternalistic system there comes the postponement of important decisions by the student. From this postponement of important decisions there follows immaturity, irresponsibility, and preoccupation with trivial rather than important issues. I firmly believe that if the American college will adopt a different attitude toward the student this circle will be reversed. Adopt the attitude of trust and the faculty will become colleagues rather than governors of the students. Faced with the necessity of governing their own conduct the students will become responsible. In acquiring responsibility they will no longer be amused by the mere superficialities of student life. . .

"I would propose certain fields for investigation by the National Student Federation. All of them are debatable fields lying among organized activities. All of them need, it seems to me, the most careful cooperation between faculty and students if that vitalizing of the course of study which we all desire is to result. The fields are: (1) the student and his support; (2) the student and his choice of life work; (3) the student and his political status; (4) the student in academic and non-academic life; (5) faculty research and undergraduate instruction; (6) the choice of the college and the choice of the field of work; and finally (7) the college student and other college students. In all these fields, it seems to me, gaps exist which prevent understanding and which prevent students engaged in one from seeing the meaning of the other. . .

"Consider the gap that exists between the student and his choice of life work. The keenest criticism that is made of the American college today is concerning the lack of any definite purpose in the study there carried on. The postponement by the student of his commitment to the career which he prefers and his use of the curriculum for pre-vocational work costs him several years of wasted time in his failure to determine his own needs. A movement now exists in colleges to assist the student in making his choice by revealing his own personality more completely to him. This movement goes by the name of guidance, either vocational or academic but up to the present time, so far as I am aware, we have yet to hear from any group of students as to the results achieved by the movement. Life is so short and preparation for it is so long that students ought to take this matter to heart and ought, in the use of their new responsibility, to see to it that their talk in college bears now

and then upon the choice of one's life work, and that a greater definiteness crystallizes out of such talk. . .

"The inter-relation of research by professors with the instruction of undergraduates is no less important. There have been unfortunate attempts to discourage research by undergraduate teachers or to minimize the value of research in the life of the professors. Still more unfortunate is the tendency of the professor himself to withdraw more and more within his personal field of interest for his happiest life and to set this apart from his contact with students so that his instruction becomes mechanical and artificial. His lectures are not rewritten, his discussion groups are perfunctory, and he breathes freely only when in his laboratory, or library, or office. The really vital contacts between professors and students seem to me nearly always to arise when the students come into intimate association with the professor's moments of research. There the real character of the teacher appears. Things he cares most about are conveyed to the student from his love of scholarship and his devotion to new truth. The students catch a glimpse of the divine fire and are themselves inflamed. Yet how rare is the provision in the American college curriculum for such moments. It is, I believe, largely because the students themselves, judging from the superficial qualities of the professor's attitude, remain indifferent to the things about which he cares the most, that these contacts are so seldom obtained.

"The choice of a college today is practically never made by a student because of what the college teaches or because of who teaches at the college. Yet somehow these considerations must be put in the forefront when the decision as to what college to choose is made. The relation between parents and students is here important. The choice of one's college in a continental system of education like the United States affords a large variety in the decision. And there should be greater systematic inquiry than there is as to the type of education desired. An investigation of this subject by the students in any college would clarify their own minds, and would make them authorities for classes that are to come in the future."

HENRY NOBLE MACCRACKEN, Vassar College.

THE PERILS OF MAGNANIMITY.—". . . In the minds of many who are in touch with medical institutions a feeling of apprehension is being aroused by the progressively increasing dependence of a

great educational system upon one or more centrally controlled funds. And since, in our opinion, this apprehension is based on more than the unworthy caution of suspicious natures, we believe that it should be aired in frank discussion instead of being allowed to ferment in the dark corners of vague and irritated criticism. Our remarks of course do not apply to the Rockefeller organizations alone. The General Education Board idea has appealed to other philanthropists; and for this every sensible medical man should be grateful. But the best way to show gratitude, aside from cultivating one's own garden to the best of one's ability, is to contribute what one can to the reaping of the healthiest crop from the generous sowing. . .

"On the other hand we believe that, if one searches below the surface, the basis for dissatisfaction, often not clearly understood by the critics themselves, may be found in a foreboding that the guidance of medical education is to a considerable extent passing out of the hands of the universities themselves into the hands of a permanent or, at any rate, self-perpetuating body of gentlemen who, by the very force of the established relations, cannot help extending their influence over all the important centers of American education. Though the expressions of this feeling usually take the form of criticisms of the policies of the leaders of this movement, to whose labors American medicine owes a profound debt of gratitude, the heart of the problem lies not so much in a conflict of opinions as in the growth of a situation inevitably created by existing circumstances. . .

"Immediately we have a situation. The expert and his board have opinions. They also have money. The universities, too, have opinions; but often no money; never enough. The trustee-experts with the money—in all honesty, we are convinced—disavow the desire to impose their own views upon the organization of the medical schools. But if they do not approve of such organizations, their methods, or intentions, how can they conscientiously give the money? The medical schools, on the other hand, need the money very badly. Often—we know of such cases—their existence may depend upon the control of a hospital, the possession of a laboratory building. They may have convictions of one kind or another, and they may—perhaps wrongly—believe that a certain procedure is peculiarly suited to their traditions, locality, or what not. But the temptation is great to adjust in the direction that will lead to the needed assistance. . .

"The question is not: Is the vast benefit accomplished worth the risk? It *has* been, so far, undoubtedly, but the question is rather, for the thoughtful: Is the great conception in danger of losing effectiveness? And the reply to this query depends upon the answers to a number of further questions. Is there a tendency among medical schools to adjust their organizations and the nature of some of their important appointments by a process of reasoning in which the influence of such adjustment upon prospective donations plays more than a secondary role. Have any of the leaders of individual schools put their pride into their pockets, reconsidered their own decisions, and wandered like Henry the Fourth to Canossa to say, 'Father, I have erred; give me the the two millions?' In short, are there growing indications of an influence, well-intended and so far highly beneficial, which is formularizing our medical educational system by a uniform standard and subtly imposing the beliefs—however wise—of a single group?

"None of this may be true, but we believe that there is enough truth in it to necessitate frank and friendly discussion; and we believe this discussion to be especially desirable because we are not among those—and there are such—who see in the situation the sinister tentacles of the octopus reaching for power. The situation is much simpler than that, and less dramatic. There is merely a group of conscientious and well-informed gentlemen who have taken over the arduous duties and responsibilities in connection with a fund which they are trusted to spend wisely and without too much delay. They are guided by a capable scholar who has made himself one of the foremost lay students of medical education. They are beset by a clamor of requests which it is their duty to gratify in so far as they properly can do so. Many of these requests are wise, some of them are less wise, others not wise at all. The trustees have wrought mightily by the only method possible when the field was rough, stony, and full of weeds. The situation that has arisen is not of their making—surely, we believe, not desired by them. But if it exists, why not face it before it has done the harm which may not easily be undone? . . .

"We know and repeat that none of these tendencies are deliberately intentional; but that they are bound to eventuate we must also endeavor to make clear. That they have begun to develop seems indicated to us by the considerable uniformity of organization already apparent in the clinical departments of almost all the schools

that have received support, and by our impression that leaders in many of these schools—wisely, we admit, but none the less significantly—look to the foundations for advice and guidance at least as much as to their own university councils and colleagues. . ."

HANS ZINSSER, Harvard University,
in the *Atlantic Monthly*, February, 1927.

LOCAL AND CHAPTER NOTES

HARVARD.—*The New Plan of Honors in English.* "Under the new plan, there is to be only one system of honors, but of two kinds and of equal ranking value: General Honors in English Literature and Allied Subjects, Special Honors in English Language and Literature. The Special Honors corresponds roughly to honors under the old plan, while in the General Honors, Anglo-Saxon is not required and only one course in the pre-Shakespearean period is compulsory. The detailed differences need not detain us; it is the division that is significant and the probable results of that division which are important.

"A superficial consideration might lead to the conclusion that it is merely an attempt to meet the needs of those who desire what is sometimes termed a 'gentleman's knowledge' of Literature, as compared with those who aim at a more detailed or scholarly knowledge, but such a view misses the real significance of the change. Intentionally or otherwise, the new plan is a recognition and enunciation of the principle that Language as Language and Language as Literature are two distinct things, that Philology and Linguistics are a specialized field, calling for a special aptitude, and that a real appreciation and knowledge of Literature, as Literature, can exist without any profound knowledge of that field.

"The immediate result as far as the undergraduate is concerned is that a proficiency in Anglo-Saxon and an interest in pre-Chaucerian Literature is no longer regarded as indicative of a higher type of intelligence and entitled to a higher grading, and that an opportunity and encouragement is offered to those men whose interest is in Literature rather than in English Literature or in English Literature rather than in Anglo-Saxon and Linguistics. This will mean that in future only those students whose natural bent inclines them to the special field will elect that field, which is as it should be. Incidentally the whole approach to Literature is placed on a broader basis. Another very healthy and hopeful sign in the new plan is that the main emphasis is laid on the student's showing in the examinations written and oral and no longer on the mere accumulation of honor grades in courses.

L. DENIS PETERKIN, *The Harvard Alumni Bulletin*, Jan. 27, 1927.

Periods of Reading without Instruction. "The Corporation and the Board of Overseers of Harvard University have approved a

report presented by the Faculty of Arts and Sciences which states that the annual period of teaching and examination at Harvard is now from two to three months longer than in British and European universities and that the long period of continuous teaching lessens the opportunity for maximum accomplishment on the part of the student, and for writing and research on the part of the teacher.

"As a means of securing two desired ends—the partial freeing of students from a minute and continuous supervision of their studies, and the relief of teachers from part of their excessive burden of teaching—lectures and tutoring will be suspended during two periods of the academic year. Those two periods will, however, remain integral parts of the term time, and neither students nor instructors are to be away without securing leave of absence.

"Any department may discontinue lectures and other classroom exercises for the two and a half weeks between Christmas recess and the mid-year examination period and for a period of approximately three and one-half weeks prior to the final examination period in June. This does not apply to elementary courses including all courses open to freshmen.

"Tutoring also is to be suspended during those two periods, except for seniors in May before their general examinations; but the students will be given assignments of reading or other work to do.

"The faculty feels that the college student needs liberty as well as direction and supervision. He must have time for consecutive reading and for other large tasks, free from a schedule that breaks up his work into small unrelated units. The release of students from classroom appointments occurs at times of the year when, because of the imminence of examination, the risk of neglect of work is least; and the cessation of lectures occurs in the one case when they are least effective (January 3-20), and in the other when the task of reading theses and conducting oral examination of graduates is, for the members of the faculty, a full stint of work by itself.

"The departments or divisions adopting the plan may put it into effect in the academic year 1927-28. It is expected that mid-year and final examination papers will have to be prepared and graded with especial care and that for the first few years there will probably be an increased number of failures among students who are disposed to neglect their studies."

MINNESOTA.—*Student Increase* “. . . 1. The cost per student remained almost stationary or has actually declined in all of the colleges of the University since 1912-1913, except in Dentistry where costs have increased but have been met largely through the dentistry fees, and in Mines where the costs per student have been increased by the reduction of enrolment. The cost for salaries of teachers and departmental supplies in the College of Science, Literature, and the Arts had decreased from \$155.79 per student in 1912-13 to \$136.68 per student in 1925-26 while the registration has increased from 1618 to 4609. This decrease in cost has occurred in spite of the great decrease in purchasing power of the dollar.

“2. Since 1913-14 the enrolment for the entire University has increased more than 240 per cent. During the same period the faculty has increased 81 per cent. The average number of student credit hours carried by each member of the Arts faculty in 1914-15 was 262; in 1925-26 it was 320. Each member of this faculty is teaching 22 per cent more students now than in 1914-15. To put in terms of the student, he had one-fifth less time on the average from each instructor and his chances at the education he sought were that much less. The College of Science, Literature, and the Arts does 45 per cent of the total teaching in the University; it has only 32 per cent of the teaching faculty. It lays the foundation for all professional training. Its limitation affects in the end every one of its students who is planning to be a lawyer, doctor, dentist, or business man.

“3. A similar situation relative to an increase in the teaching load without a corresponding increase in the teaching staff exists in the College of Education and the School of Medicine, and to a slightly less extent in most of the other colleges and schools of the University. . .

“The amount which the State of Minnesota is appropriating for higher education is much less than the amount which neighboring states are appropriating for higher education, and Minnesota, it should be remembered, is in competition with those states for the standard and quality of higher education it seeks to maintain.

“During the four-year period ending June 30, 1927, for general support, buildings, and land for higher education (exclusive of normal schools):

Illinois appropriated.....	\$21,894,339.00
Iowa appropriated.....	26,255,095.01

Michigan appropriated.....	25,482,806.00
Ohio appropriated.....	22,173,135.94
Minnesota appropriated.....	17,733,173.00

"There is not so much wealth, to be sure, in Minnesota as there is in some of these other states, but the per capita wealth is higher in Minnesota than it is in Ohio, Illinois, or Michigan. The total wealth of Minnesota is but little less than that of Iowa. On the basis of the total wealth of the two states, if the University of Minnesota received proportionately as much as Iowa is appropriating for higher education, the appropriations for the University during the last four-year period would have been in excess of \$21,000,000. In other words, if the state of Minnesota were taxing herself as heavily for higher education as Iowa is, the University would have received approximately a million dollars more a year during each of the last four years than she has been receiving.

"A progressive people should be taught not merely how to save but rather how to earn more and to make its increased earnings minister to its health, its comfort, and its happiness in manifold ways. There is no virtue in saving, in economy for its own sake; there is no virtue in economy that means too few instructors, poor instruction, and inadequate equipment, and a stationary policy of administration."

I. D. COFFMAN, in the *Minnesota Alumni Weekly*,
January 22, 1927.

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY.—Centres of instruction are to be established in Europe this summer by New York University for the benefit of summer students. Courses will be recognized for credit by the various schools of the University provided the student has been regularly matriculated or has met all the requirements for matriculation in the particular school, and if the course is satisfactory to the scholarship committee. Graduate and undergraduate courses are planned, also courses for teachers. The centres will be Madrid, Berlin, Tours or Grenoble, Rome, and Geneva.

NORTH DAKOTA.—*Constitution of the Local Chapter of the Association.*

I—Name and Object

The name of this organization shall be the University of

North Dakota Chapter of the American Association of University Professors.

The objects shall be to facilitate a more effective cooperation among teachers and investigators in this University for the promotion of the interests of higher education and research, and in general to increase the usefulness and advance the standards and ideals of the profession.

II—*Membership*

Any teacher or investigator in this University who for three years has held a position of teaching or research in this University or in any university, college or in a professional school of similar grade, in the United States or Canada, may be nominated for membership in the American Association of University Professors.

All such teachers and investigators affiliated with the University of North Dakota who have been elected to membership in the National Association are members of this Chapter.

III—*Officers and Executive Committee*

The Officers of this Chapter shall be a President, a Vice-President, and a Secretary-Treasurer who shall be elected annually at the last meeting of the academic year.

The Executive Committee shall consist of the elective officers, the Past-President, and one additional member elected by the Chapter.

IV—*Meetings*

There shall be four regular meetings each year held at such time in the months of October, December, February, and April as the Executive Committee may determine.

Special meetings may be called by the President or shall be called at the request of five members.

In order to bring about a closer relation with the North Dakota Agricultural College one member of the Chapter in that institution shall be invited to be the guest and speaker of this Chapter at one of the regular meetings each year.

V—*By-Laws*

By-laws may be adopted at any regular meeting of the chapter.

VI—*Amendments*

This Constitution may be amended by a three-fourths vote

at any regular meeting, notice having been given at a previous meeting.

BY-LAWS

An assessment of not to exceed fifty cents per member per year may be levied to meet the general expenses of the Chapter.

From the fund arising from the Chapter rebate the sum of five dollars (\$5.00) shall be expended annually for a copy of the Report of the Annual Meeting of the National Association.

Regular subscriptions to the *Bulletin* at one dollar (\$1.00) each shall be made each year for the President's Office at the University, and for the President of the Board of Administration at Bismarck.

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY.—*Family Background and College Success.* A letter in *School and Society* for February 19, discusses statistics of freshmen and sophomore students of liberal arts, and juniors and seniors of the school of commerce with the following conclusion: "The results do not at all indicate that the children of foreign-born parents or of parents of only high school education or those having brothers and sisters of college experience are generally superior people. They indicate rather that among men of the type studied selective factors and college conditions operate so that on the whole these groups at Northwestern will probably do slightly better work. When it is noted that the differences in means are only a small part of the entire range of possible point averages, and also since it is true that the ranges of individual point averages are almost identical, the practical significance with us of these factors in selecting students approaches insignificance."

PENNSYLVANIA, VICE-PROVOSTS.—It is announced that the title of president, held by the provost, has been dropped and that hereafter there will be three vice-provosts, each in charge of a division of the university administration. Dr. J. H. Penniman continues as provost, Dr. G. W. McClelland as vice-provost will be directly in charge of community life and will preside at academic functions in the absence of the provost. Mr. G. A. Brakeley—for two and one-half years director of the University of Pennsylvania Fund—as vice-provost will have direct charge of the relations of the University with the public and the oversight of such university activities

as are concerned with this. A third vice-provost to be elected will have charge of the division of educational work of the University.

PRINCETON STUDENT GOVERNMENT.—The Board of Trustees of Princeton University at their meeting on February 25, issued an order forbidding undergraduate students to own or operate automobiles. As a consequence the Senior Council at its weekly meeting resigned in a body. The fifteen members voted unanimously in support of a resolution taking this action in the form of the following letter addressed to the entire student body.

"To the undergraduates of Princeton University:

WHEREAS, The status of student self-government at Princeton appears to us indeterminate at present, inasmuch as a decision vitally affecting undergraduate life has recently been reached with disregard for student opinion; and,

WHEREAS, We feel that the time has come for a definite understanding between the administration and the student body as to the actual power which shall be exercised by a student governing body;

We, the 1927 Senior Council, hereby tender our resignation to take effect at once.

In taking the action we wish it to be clear that we are expressing neither objection nor approval regarding the substance of the act of the Board of Trustees forbidding student ownership and operation of automobiles, but that we are expressing objection to the principle involved in its passage."

The ruling of the Board of Trustees follows:

"After July 1, 1927, no undergraduate shall, while college is in session, maintain or operate an automobile within the Borough of Princeton or in the neighborhood thereof without the consent of the president of the university or the dean of the college."

As a result of the resignation of the Senior Council, *The Daily Princetonian*, the student newspaper, advocates a student referendum to determine the opinion of the undergraduate body concerning the type of government it wishes. It is proposed that three proposals will be voted upon—government as in the past by a Senior Council, government by a general student council, and government by the administration of the university.

School and Society, No. 636.

SMITH.—*The New Curriculum for Freshmen and Sophomores*. "Last spring, then, the faculty commissioned the Committee on the Course of Study to prepare a revision of the curriculum for the freshman and sophomore years. The Committee has been working steadily on the plan. It was the final plan proposed by this Committee, after months of work, with constant consultation and conference with the faculty, that the faculty approved on December 8. The final plan represented a cooperative undertaking on the part of the faculty and the Committee.

"The chief features of the new curriculum are: a reduction of the groups from ten to four, the requiring of a minimum number of hours in each group in place of requiring specific courses, and a plan for fulfilling the language requirement by examinations on a reading knowledge of two foreign languages.

"The present group system has grown up, apparently. It has no special basis in logic or in educational theory. The number of groups is accidental. There is no special magic in ten. And the distribution of departments within the groups is equally a matter of growth rather than principle. The new curriculum replaces the ten groups with four groups which rest, so far as logic is possible in these things, on clearly marked divisions of knowledge. The language group is distinct from the others in aim and method. Literature and the arts, placed together, are set off from the others by their emphasis on expression. In the third group, the sciences, the principle is obvious, and the fourth, the social sciences, are as naturally connected. These four groups are four recognized divisions of knowledge, four types of discipline. There is in three of these groups a time requirement. Particular courses which the student shall take are no longer specified. This arrangement still insures a reasonable distribution of work in the freshman and sophomore years, and some acquaintance with the various divisions of knowledge. Yet this time requirement is an elastic requirement. It leaves the student free in the various fields to choose her specific subjects, and this opportunity to choose should bring, we believe, added incentive to good work and added interest. This should be true even if the courses elected are those formerly prescribed. Now they will tend to be taken by those who need them, by those whose previous training, interest, experience, and abilities have created a background and stimulated a need."

FRANCES F. BERNARD, in *The Smith Alumnae Quarterly*, Feb., 1927.

YALE COLLEGE.—*Board of Admissions* ". . . The tests for fitness now employed by the Yale examiners give a reasonably secure basis for selection. About eight men in a hundred drop out of college during freshman year by reason of poor scholarship. A considerable proportion of these failures is due to financial or other hardship and not to incapacity. In Yale College, the wastage for all causes for the whole period covered by the Alumni Directory is but 12.9 per cent through the year 1917, and but 16.2 per cent with the war period included. . ."

ROBERT N. CORWIN, *Chairman*.

The Freshman Year ". . . In the original plan of a curriculum for the common freshman year the desire to make it possible for all students at the end of the year to elect any course of study on an equality with their classmates led to the adoption of a device by which those who were deficient in their preparation in science or mathematics could take longer courses in those subjects and so make up the deficiency. These courses imposed an inevitable hardship. Normally, with five three-hour courses a freshman should be engaged fifteen hours per week in the classroom. The longer courses added two hours each to his schedule. Seventeen hours, therefore, was not an unusual schedule, and nineteen hours was more common than desirable. Fully to appreciate the significance of this added burden we should estimate two hours of preparation for each hour of class engagements. This allows forty-five working hours for a normal schedule, and fifty-one and fifty-seven hours, respectively, for the extended courses. Forty-four hours is an eight-hour day for five and one-half days. The wisdom of requiring students to devote more than eight hours per day to their tasks is questionable. In practice it has frequently turned out that those who had a 'long course' were the students least able to stand the extra strain, and their long schedule sometimes became a contributing cause of failure. . .

"It is a matter of sincere regret that it has become necessary to discontinue the orientation course, 'Introduction to the Social Sciences,' that has been offered to freshmen during the last three years. This course, in content and presentation quite unlike any of the regular disciplines of school or college, added a very desirable element of novelty to the freshman curriculum. Dealing with man's adjustment to his environment and the development of his insti-

tutions, it formed a valuable background to later work in the Social and Political Sciences, Government, and allied subjects. . .

"The course was given up most regretfully, by the freshman faculty, not because of lack of success, but because it was handicapped by adverse conditions which could not at present be satisfactorily adjusted. We sincerely hope that a way can be found to reestablish it, or some course closely resembling it, in the near future. . .

"Our practice in modern languages does not lend itself to a systematic sectioning of the better students. It is of the utmost importance that the class should not be deprived of the more adept, for emulation of each other is one of the most active impulses to insure fluency in a spoken language. The proper placement of students in more or less advanced sections has been gradually improved so that now a man who for any reason is in a higher or lower division than his preparation warrants can be quickly found and the situation righted. . .

"Six years of experience have amply demonstrated the useful role played by our student counselors and the wisdom of the flexible and informal plan of administration of the system originally devised. The voluntary character of the work, the purely personal relationship with the students, the small number of men assigned to each counselor, all make towards a natural and friendly acquaintance, helpful to both student and counselor. The strength of this service and the chief element in its success has, without doubt, been the spirit of the instructors enrolled, their initiative, enthusiasm, and human sympathy. . ."

PERCY T. WALDEN, Dean. "Reports to the President of Yale University," 1925-1926.

COMMITTEES FOR 1927

Executive Committee of the Council

Chairman, W. T. Semple (Classics), Cincinnati

H. V. Ames (History), Pennsylvania; Joseph Mayer (Econ.), Tufts; Paul Monroe (Educ.), Columbia; M. W. Sampson (Eng.), Cornell; J. S. P. Tatlock (Eng.), Harvard; H. W. Tyler (Math.), Mass. Inst. Tech.

Committee to Nominate Officers

Chairman W. T. Magruder (Mech. Eng.), Ohio State

G. D. Hancock (Econ.), Washington and Lee; R. H. Keniston (Rom. Lang.), Chicago; H. L. Rietz (Math.), Iowa; Marion P. Whitney (German), Vassar.

COMMITTEE A

Academic Freedom and Tenure

Chairman A. M. Kidd (Law), Columbia

Eastern Group: F. A. Fetter (Econ.), Princeton; J. P. Lichtenberger (Sociol.), Pennsylvania; A. O. Lovejoy (Philos.), Johns Hopkins; E. S. Thurston (Law), Yale; A. L. Wheeler (Latin), Princeton.

Central Group: F. S. Deibler (Econ.), Northwestern; H. F. Goodrich (Law), Michigan; G. L. Roberts (Vocational Educ.), Purdue; U. G. Weatherly (Sociol.), Indiana; Quincy Wright (Pol. Sci.), Chicago.

Western Group: G. P. Adams (Philos.), California; H. R. Fairclough (Classics), Stanford; O. K. McMurray (Jurisprudence), California; F. M. Padelford (Eng.), Washington (Seattle); R. C. Tolman (Chem.) Calif. Inst. Tech.; H. B. Torrey (Biol.), Oregon.

COMMITTEE F

Admission of Members

Chairman, F. A. Saunders (Physics), Harvard

W. C. Allee (Biol.), Chicago; Florence Bascom (Geol.), Bryn Mawr; A. L. Bouton (Eng.), New York; E. S. Brightman (Ethics), Boston; J. Q. Dealey (Sociol.), Brown; E. C. Hinsdale (German), Mt. Holyoke; A. L. Keith (Latin), S. Dakota; G. H. Marx (Engin.), Stanford.

COMMITTEE I

University Ethics

Chairman, J. H. Tufts (Philos.), Chicago

G. P. Costigan, Jr. (Law), California; G. W. Cunningham (Philos.), Cornell; John Dewey (Philos.), Columbia; W. B. Munro (Pol. Sci.), Harvard; E. A. Ross (Sociol.), Wisconsin; U. G. Weatherly (Sociol.), Indiana.

SPECIAL COMMITTEES

COMMITTEE B

Methods of Appointment and Promotion

Chairman, Hardin Craig (Eng.), Iowa

G. E. Barnett (Econ.), Johns Hopkins; J. S. Bassett (History), Smith; R. J. Bonner (Greek), Chicago; Percy Bordwell (Law), Iowa; J. M. Coulter (Botany), Boyce Thompson Inst.; Clive Day (Econ.), Yale; Max Farrand (History), Commonwealth Fund, New York; R. C. Flickinger (Classics), Iowa; E. E. Hale (Eng.), Union; V. C. Hill (Classics), Ohio University; F. E. Lumley (Sociol.), Ohio State; W. E. McElfresh (Physics), Williams; Herbert Martin (Philos.), Drake; T. H. Morgan (Zool.), Columbia; R. M. Wenley (Philos.), Michigan; J. A. Woodburn (History), Indiana.

COMMITTEE C

International Relations

Chairman, E. R. A. Seligman (Pol. Econ.), Columbia

Edward Capps (Classics), Princeton; John Dewey (Philos.), Columbia; C. H. Haskins (History), Harvard; J. C. Merriam, Carnegie Institution, Washington, D. C.; R. A. Millikan (Physics), Calif. Inst. Tech.; Paul VanDyke (History), Princeton; L. S. Rowe, Pan-American Union, Washington, D. C.; J. H. Wigmore (Law), Northwestern.

COMMITTEE D

Relation of Vocational to General Higher Education

Chairman, Lucile Eaves (Sociol.), Simmons

J. M. Brewer (Educ.), Harvard; E. F. Buchner (Educ.), Johns Hopkins; A. M. Cathcart (Law), Stanford; T. de Laguna (Philos.), Bryn Mawr; D. L. Edsall (Medicine), Harvard; H. S. Fry (Chem.),

Cincinnati; A. B. Hart (History), Harvard; H. H. Higbie (Engin.), Michigan; G. O. James (Astron.), Washington; W. F. Magie (Physics), Princeton; W. B. Pillsbury (Psychol.), Michigan.

COMMITTEE E

Local Chapters

Chairman, E. S. Allen (Math.), Iowa State College

(Committee awaiting organization)

COMMITTEE G

Methods of Increasing the Intellectual Interest and Raising the Intellectual Standards of Undergraduates

Chairman (awaiting appointment)

H. H. Bender (Philol.), Princeton; J. J. Coss (Philos.), Columbia; Henry Crew (Physics), Northwestern; Anna A. Cutler (Philos.), Smith; T. D. Eliot (Sociol.), Northwestern; C. M. Gayley (Eng.), California; G. R. Havens (Rom. Lang.), Ohio State; J. H. Hildebrand (Chem.), California; T. F. Holgate (Math), Northwestern; G. A. Miller (Math.), Illinois; W. J. Newlin (Philos.), Amherst; James I. Osborne (Eng.), Wabash; A. L. Owen (Span.), Kansas; Ralph B. Perry (Philos.), Harvard; R. K. Root (Eng.), Princeton; G. W. Stewart (Physics), Iowa; T. A. Storey (Hygiene), Stanford; A. C. Trowbridge (Geol.), Iowa; E. H. Wilkins (Rom. Lang.), Chicago; H. V. Wilson (Biol.), North Carolina.

COMMITTEE H

Desirability and Practicability of Increased Migration and Interchange of Graduate Students

Chairman, A. O. Leuschner (Astron.), California

E. R. Hedrick (Math.), California (So. Br.); F. W. Kelsey (Latin), Michigan; A. W. Meyer (Anat.), Stanford; F. W. Taussig (Econ.), Harvard; J. W. Young (Math.), Dartmouth.

COMMITTEE K

Systems for Sabbatical Years

Chairman, F. N. Scott (Rhetoric), Michigan

C. M. Andrews (History), Yale; O. J. Campbell (Eng.), Michigan; Margaret C. Ferguson (Botany), Wellesley; Tenney Frank (Latin),

Johns Hopkins; J. Jastrow (Psychol.), Wisconsin; A. C. Lanier (Engin.), Missouri; Ernest Merritt (Physics), Cornell; J. B. Pratt (Philos.), Williams; O. E. Randall (Mech.), Brown; W. L. Upson, (Elec. Engin.), Washington Univ.; R. M. Wenley (Philos.), Michigan; Frederick Slocum (Astron.), Wesleyan.

COMMITTEE L

Cooperation with Latin-American Universities to Promote Exchange Professorships and Fellowships, etc.

Chairman, L. S. Rowe (Director-General, Pan-American Union), Washington

G. H. Blakeslee¹ (History), Clark; E. E. Brandon (Rom. Lang.), Miami; Philip M. Brown (Int. Law), Princeton; S. P. Capen,¹ Chancellor, University of Buffalo; H. T. Collings (Econ.), Pennsylvania; A. C. Coolidge (History), Harvard; I. J. Cox (History), Northwestern; S. P. Duggan (Educ.), City of New York; Edith Fahnestock (Spanish), Vassar; A. C. Flick (History) (State Historian Office), Albany, N. Y.; J. D. M. Ford (Rom. Lang.), Harvard; C. W. Hackett¹ (Hist.), Texas; E. C. Hills (Rom. Lang.), California; Julius Kline,¹ Department of Commerce, Washington, D. C.; H. G. James (Govern.), Nebraska; P. A. Martin (Hist.), Stanford; J. Fred Rippey¹ (Hist.), Chicago; E. A. Ross (Sociol.), Wisconsin; Arthur R. Seymour (Rom. Lang.), Florida; G. H. Stuart (Pol. Sci.), Stanford; Glen L. Swiggett¹ (Rom. Lang.), Washington, D. C.

COMMITTEE M

Freedom of Teaching in Science

Chairman, S. J. Holmes (Zoology), California

Joseph Allen (Math.), New York City; J. H. Breasted (Oriental Lang.), Chicago; G. A. Coe (Psychol.), Evanston, Ill.; E. G. Conklin (Biology), Princeton; J. V. Denney (Eng.), Ohio State; John Dewey (Philos.), Columbia; R. F. Griggs (Botany), George Washington; Vernon Kellogg, National Research Council; A. O. Lovejoy (Philos.), Johns Hopkins; Shailer Mathews (Theol.), Chicago; R. A. Millikan (Physics), Calif. Inst. Tech.; E. C. Moore (Theol.), Harvard; Herbert Osborn (Zool.), Ohio State; W. Patten (Biol.), Dartmouth; A. H. Turner (Zool.), Mt. Holyoke; H. E. Walter (Biol.), Brown; W. H. Welch (Pathol.), Johns Hopkins.

¹ Associate members.

COMMITTEE N

Student Health

Chairman, J. E. Raycroft (Phys. Educ.), Princeton

Howard Diehl¹ (Student Health), Minnesota. W. E. Forsyth¹ (Hygiene), Michigan; C. W. Goddard (Phys. Educ.), Texas; R. T. Legge (Hygiene), California; D. B. Reed (Phys. Educ.), Chicago; T. A. Storey (Hygiene), Stanford; Elizabeth B. Thelberg (Hygiene), Vassar; Marjorie Waggoner¹ (Student Health), Bryn Mawr; H. Shindle Wingert¹ (Phys. Educ.), Ohio State.

COMMITTEE P

Pensions and Insurance

Chairman, W. W. Cook (Law), Johns Hopkins

S. S. Huebner (Finance), Pennsylvania; E. W. Kemmerer (Econ.), Princeton; H. L. Rietz (Math.), Iowa; W. F. Wilcox (Econ.), Cornell.

COMMITTEE R

Encouragement of University Research

Chairman, W. A. Oldfather (Latin), Illinois

E. C. Armstrong (Rom. Lang.), Princeton; E. Blackwelder (Geol.), Stanford; C. Becker (History), Cornell; A. C. L. Brown (Celtic), Northwestern; N. M. Fenneman (Geol.), Cincinnati; A. R. Hohlfeld (German), Wisconsin; R. G. Kent (Comp. Philol.), Pennsylvania; J. L. Lowes (Eng.), Harvard; W. A. Nitze (Rom. Lang.), Chicago; Joel Stebbins (Astron.), Wisconsin; R. C. Tolman (Phys. Chem.), Calif. Inst. Tech.; C. C. Torrey (Oriental Lang.), Yale.

COMMITTEE W

Status of Women in College and University Faculties

Chairman, A. Caswell Ellis (Educ.), Western Reserve

Florence Bascom (Geol.), Bryn Mawr; Cora J. Beckwith (Zool.), Vassar; Harriet W. Bigelow (Astron.), Smith; Isabelle Bronk (French), Swarthmore; Carleton Brown (Philol.), Bryn Mawr; Caroline Colvin (Latin), Maine; John Dewey (Philos.), Columbia; Anna J. McKeag (Educ.), Wellesley; D. C. Munro (History), Princeton; Louise Pound (Eng.), Nebraska; Louise Stanley (Bureau of Home Economics), Washington, D. C.; Marion Talbot, Chicago;

¹ Associate members.

G. M. Whipple¹ (Educ.), Michigan; W. F. Willcox (Econ.), Cornell;
A. B. Wolfe (Econ.), Ohio State.

COMMITTEE Z

The Economic Condition of the Profession and Income Tax Questions

Chairman, J. H. Hollander (Pol. Sci.), Johns Hopkins

T. S. Adams (Pol. Econ.), Yale; C. C. Arbuthnot (Econ.), Western Reserve; W. A. Berridge (Econ.), Brown; T. N. Carver (Econ.), Harvard; Alzada Comstock (Econ.), Mt. Holyoke; W. W. Cook (Law), Johns Hopkins; R. M. Haig (Bus. Organ.), Columbia; J. Jastrow (Semitic Lang.), Wisconsin; E. W. Kemmerer (Econ.), Princeton; C. C. Plehn (Econ.), California; W. T. Semple (Latin), Cincinnati; Alexander Silverman (Chem.), Pittsburgh.

ASSOCIATION REPRESENTATIVES

American Council on Education: H. G. Doyle (Rom. Lang.), George Washington; H. C. Lancaster (Rom. Lang.), Johns Hopkins; H. W. Tyler (Math.), Mass. Inst. Tech.

American University Union: E. C. Armstrong (Rom. Lang.), Princeton; A. O. Lovejoy (Philos.), Johns Hopkins; H. W. Tyler (Math.), Mass. Inst. Tech.

American Association for the Advancement of Science: J. M. Coulter (Botany), Boyce Thompson Institute; S. A. Mitchell (Astron.), Virginia.

National Research Council: W. A. Oldfather (Latin), Illinois.

¹ Associate member.

MEMBERSHIP

MEMBERS ELECTED

The Committee on Admissions announces the election of one hundred and eighty-six members, as follows:

Adelphi College, M. Helene Lewinsohn, E. A. Méras, Ruth Mohl, Edna Mosher; **American University**, F. W. Collier, H. M. Dudley, D. O. Kinsman; **Amherst College**, R. A. Beebe, R. C. Williams; **Bethany College**, F. R. Gay; **Brown University**, L. A. Bigelow, H. E. Miller; **Bucknell University**, R. L. Matz; **Butler College**, C. E. Aldrich, Sarah H. Baumgartner, Allegra Stewart; **University of Chattanooga**, Ruth Perry; **Clark University**, S. J. Brandenburg, C. F. Brooks, C. F. Jones, H. P. Little, J. P. Nafe, David Potter; **Dartmouth College**, J. H. Gerould; **Davidson College**, Frazer Hood, G. B. Watts; **Denison University**, J. D. Crawford, Frances B. Cressey, Mary E. Downey, B. W. Stevenson, Charles West; **Duke University**, H. L. Blomquist, Johannes S. Buck, W. W. Elliott, W. W. Rankin, J. F. Rippey, J. H. Shields; **George Washington University**, P. E. Gropp, E. A. Hill, F. A. Moss, J. O. Powers; **Gettysburg College**, Otto Müller; **Hamline University**, W. A. Kenyon; **Hood College**, Helen E. Manning; **Hunter College**, Ernst Riess; **Iowa State College**, Elizabeth E. Hoyt; **Kansas State College**, C. E. Rogers; **University of Kentucky**, L. L. Dantzler; **Lehigh University**, D. S. Chamberlin, L. R. Drown, A. A. Diefenderfer, E. Y. Lindsay, M. J. Luch, R. P. More, Maurice Picard, J. M. Toohy, F. M. Weida; **University of Louisville**, J. F. Bradley, M. W. Caskey, Louise Diecks, Ethel B. duPont, R. C. Ernst, W. F. Hamilton, Zelma K. Jenks, Rolf Johannesen, W. P. Jones, Sara Landau; **University of Maryland**, Susan E. Harman, F. M. Lemon, C. J. Pierson, S. I. Silin; **University of Minnesota**, S. P. Miller; **University of Missouri**, H. H. Charlton, H. F. Major; **University of Montana**, J. H. Bradley, Jr., S. J. Coon, R. L. Housman, C. W. Leapheart, E. R. Sanford, J. W. Severy, B. E. Thomas, O. Tonning, C. W. Waters; **University of New Hampshire**, L. W. Hitchcock, Edythe Tingley; **University of North Carolina**, L. S. Forrest, S. H. Hobbs, Jr.; **North Dakota Agricultural College**, Minnie A. Anderson; Alba Bales, A. H. Benton, L. L. Carrick, J. R. Dice, Alice P. Dinan, R. M. Dolve, F. C. Householder, A. F. Hunsaker, P. J. Iverson, Kenneth Kuhn, Frances A. Lamb, C. I. Nelson, Harriet Pearson, W. T. Rolf, A. F. Schalk, J. H. Shepperd, Elvira T. Smith, O. A. Stevens, C. L. Swisher, C.

B. Waldron; **Ohio Wesleyan University**, F. S. Fearing, R. C. Hunter, H. J. Sheridan, F. A. Spencer; **University of Oklahoma**, Mary M. Baird, Grace A. Brown, Eva Ellsworth Dungan, J. M. Essenberg, M. R. Everett, O. F. Evans, Dora McFarland, Elsie J. McFarland, J. W. Shepherd; **Park College**, M. H. Wilson; **Pennsylvania State College**, F. T. Struck; **Purdue University**, J. E. Brock; **University of Richmond**, C. T. Goode, R. E. Loring, Garnett Ryland; **Rutgers University**, C. M. Hall; **South Dakota State College**, R. E. McConwell, H. J. Wing; **Syracuse University**, Ernest Reed, G. A. Wilson; **Temple University**, W. T. Caldwell; **University of Texas**, J. L. Boysen, Lilia M. Casis, F. F. Covington, Jr., G. C. Engerrand, J. A. Fitzgerald, Mary Gearing, C. C. Glascock, A. T. Granger, T. P. Harrison, Bess Heflin, L. M. Hollander, Roberta Lavender, E. K. McGinnis, H. T. Manuel, J. L. Mecham, E. T. Mitchell, C. M. Montgomery, I. I. Nelson, C. P. Patterson, D. A. Piatt, E. E. Pittman, Arnold Romberg, Aaron Schaffer, Philipp Seiberth, G. W. Stocking, A. B. Swanson, C. A. Swanson, P. J. Thompson, W. P. Webb, Katharine Wheatley, Jet C. Winters; **Trinity College**, T. H. Bissonnette; **Union College**, A. J. Palermo; **United States Military Academy**, L. H. Holt; **University of Vermont**, D. B. Carroll, J. E. Donahue, Harvey Jordan, Bertha M. Terrill; **Washington and Jefferson College**, J. B. Anderson; **Washington University**, C. H. Farr, H. R. Grummann; **Wellesley College**, Helen J. Sleeper; **Wesleyan College**, J. W. W. Daniel; **West Virginia University**, L. H. Taylor, H. S. Wolfe; **Williams College**, M. W. Avery, E. C. Cole, C. F. Remer, J. H. Roberts; **University of Wisconsin**, S. A. Leonard, J. L. Sellars, R. H. Whitbeck; **University of Wyoming**, W. O. Clough.

NOMINATIONS FOR MEMBERSHIP

The following eighty-seven nominations are printed as provided under Article IV of the Constitution. Objection to any nominee may be addressed to the Secretary, H. W. Tyler, Cambridge, Mass., or to the Chairman of the Committee on Admissions¹ and will be considered by the Committee if received before May 20, 1927.

The Committee on Admissions consists of F. A. Saunders (Harvard), *Chairman*, W. C. Allee (Chicago), Florence Bascom (Bryn Mawr), A. L. Bouton (New York), J. Q. Dealey (Brown), E. C. Hinsdale (Mt. Holyoke), A. L. Keith (South Dakota), G. H. Marx (Stanford).

Karl M. Arndt (Economics), Nebraska

H. R. Baker (Biology), Delaware

Grace Barnes (Library), Maryland

Florence M. Barnett (Commerce), Georgia State (Women)

Joseph Battista (Spanish and Italian), Washington (St. Louis)

J. P. Beeson (Chemistry), Georgia State (Women)

Leo Blumberg (Mechanical Engineering), Delaware

Euri Belle Bolton (Psychology), Georgia State (Women)

H. S. Booth (Chemistry), Western Reserve

H. E. Bradford (Vocational Education), Nebraska

J. H. Brown (French), Washington (St. Louis)

S. M. Brown (History), Lehigh

Maude Cheek (Biology), Mississippi State (Women)

A. R. Collett (Chemistry), West Virginia

R. V. Cook (Physics), Bethany

Winifred G. Crowell (English), Georgia State (Women)

Elliott C. Cutler (Surgery), Western Reserve

Jean S. Davis (Economics), Agnes Scott

Emily S. Dexter (Education and Psychology), Agnes Scott

G. R. Dodson (Philosophy), Washington

H. P. Dutton (Commerce), Northwestern

Martha O. Eckford (Hygiene), Mississippi State (Women)

Carl Engelder (Chemistry), Pittsburgh

C. R. Evans (Biology), Mississippi State (Women)

Agnes E. Filler (Home Economics), Mississippi State (Women)

Charles S. Fox (Romance Languages), Lehigh

Herbert S. Gasser (Pharmacology), Washington (St. Louis)

¹ Nominations should in all cases be presented through the Secretary, H. W. Tyler, 222 Charles River Road, Cambridge, Mass.

L. J. Gaylord (Mathematics), Agnes Scott
Mary B. Gray (Geography), Georgia State (Women)
W. K. Greene (English), Wesleyan (Macon, Ga.)
Helen H. Hamill (Home Economics), Oklahoma
Emily S. Howson (Physics), Agnes Scott
C. R. Harding (Greek), Davidson
Alice C. Hunter (English), Georgia State (Women)
C. D. Hurd (Chemistry), Northwestern
Amanda Johnson (History), Georgia State (Women)
A. N. Johnson (Engineering), Maryland
F. T. Jung (Physiology), Northwestern
C. F. Kramer, Jr. (Modern Languages), Maryland
A. S. Langsdorf (Industrial Engineering), Washington (St. Louis)
W. F. Lindell (Mechanical Engineering), Delaware
W. J. Loeffel (Animal Husbandry), Nebraska
Erwart Matthews (English), Delaware
C. C. Minter (Vocational Education), Nebraska
E. L. Morgan (Rural Sociology), Missouri
M. Marie Mount (Home Economics), Maryland
Lilas Myrick (Chemistry), Georgia State (Women)
Alice Napier (Mathematics), Georgia State (Women)
Clara M. Nixon (Agriculture), Georgia State (Women)
Mamie Padgett (Art), Georgia State (Women)
G. P. Paine (Physics), Delaware
A. O'Reilly (Medical), Washington (St. Louis)
H. A. Robinson (Mathematics), Agnes Scott
E. H. Scott (Agriculture), Georgia State (Women)
H. H. Scudder (English), New Hampshire
L. A. Sherman (English), Nebraska
J. H. Simons (Chemistry), Northwestern
H. D. Simpson (Economics), Northwestern
Edmond Siroky (Applied Mathematics), Washington (St. Louis)
R. H. Skelton (English), Maryland
Annette Steele (English), Georgia State (Women)
L. E. Swearingen (Chemistry), Oklahoma
R. W. Thoroughgood (Civil Engineering), Delaware
O. A. Thaxton (Education), Georgia State (Women)
Catherine Torrance (Latin and Greek), Agnes Scott
Margaret E. Tuttle (Household Science), Georgia State (Women)
H. B. VanHoesen (Library), Princeton

- Lena Vaughn (Physics), Mississippi State (Women)
Cora Q. Walker (Chemistry), Mississippi State (Women)
R. J. D. Walters (Education), Denver
G. H. Webber (History of Education), Georgia State (Women)
G. S. Wehrwein (Economics), Northwestern
Claribel P. Welsh (Home Economics), Maryland
Alice Wildman (Education), Mississippi State (Women)
Kathleen W. Wootten (Health), Georgia State (Women)
E. H. Wuerpel (Art), Washington (St. Louis)
W. Y. Wynn (English), Georgia State (Women)